



Attorney's Docket No.: 042390.P1901R

Patent

#6
ROSE
2-16-00

DECLARATION AND POWER OF ATTORNEY FOR REISSUE PATENT APPLICATION

As a below named inventor, I hereby declare that:

My residence, post office address and citizenship are as stated below, next to my name.

I believe I am the original, first, and sole inventor (if only one name is listed below) or an original, first, and joint inventor (if plural names are listed below) of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought on the invention entitled

MULTIPLE ENCODER OUTPUT BUFFER APPARATUS FOR DIFFERENTIAL CODING OF VIDEO INFORMATION

the specification of which is attached hereto and was issued as U.S. Patent No. 5,416,520 (the "original patent") from application number 159,665, filed November 30, 1993 (the "original application").

I hereby state that I have reviewed and understand the contents of the above-identified specification, including the claim(s), as amended by any amendment referred to above. I do not know and do not believe that the claimed invention was ever known or used in the United States of America before my invention thereof, or patented or described in any printed publication in any country before my invention thereof or more than one year prior to the original application, that the same was not in public use or on sale in the United States of America more than one year prior to the original application, and that the invention has not been patented or made the subject of an inventor's certificate issued before the date of the original application in any country foreign to the United States of America on an application filed by me or my legal representatives or assigns more than twelve months (for a utility patent application) or six months (for a design patent application) prior to the original application.

I acknowledge the duty to disclose all information known to me to be material to patentability as defined in Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 1.56.

I hereby claim foreign priority benefits under Title 35, United States Code, Section 119(a)-(d), of any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate listed below and have also identified below any foreign application for patent or inventor's certificate having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed:

Prior Foreign Application(s)

Priority
Claimed

(Number)	(Country)	(Day/Month/Year Filed)	Yes	No

I hereby claim the benefit under title 35, United States Code, Section 119(e) of any United States provisional application(s) listed below

(Application Number) Filing Date

I hereby claim the benefit under Title 35, United States Code, Section 120 of any United States application(s) listed below and, insofar as the subject matter of each of the claims of this application is not disclosed in the prior United States application in the manner provided by the first paragraph of Title 35, United States Code, Section 112, I acknowledge the duty to disclose all information known to me to be material to patentability as defined in Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 1.56 which became available between the filing date of the prior application and the national or PCT international filing date of this application:

(Application Number)	Filing Date	(Status -- patented, pending, abandoned)
----------------------	-------------	---

(Application Number)	Filing Date	(Status -- patented, pending, abandoned)
----------------------	-------------	---

William E. Alford, Reg. No. 37,764; Farzad E. Amini, Reg. No. P42,261; Aloysius T. C. AuYeung, Reg. No. 35,432; William Thomas Babbitt, Reg. No. 39,591; Carol F. Barry, Reg. No. 41,600; Jordan Michael Becker, Reg. No. 39,602; Bradley J. Bereznak, Reg. No. 33,474; Michael A. Bernadicou, Reg. No. 35,934; Roger W. Blakely, Jr., Reg. No. 25,831; Gregory D. Caldwell, Reg. No. 39,926; Ronald C. Card, Reg. No. P44,587; Thomas M. Coester, Reg. No. 39,637; Stephen M. De Clerk, under 37 C.F.R. § 10.9(b); Michael Anthony DeSanctis, Reg. No. 39,957; Daniel M. De Vos, Reg. No. 37,813; Robert Andrew Diehl, Reg. No. 40,992; Matthew C. Fagan, Reg. No. 37,542; Tarek N. Fahmi, Reg. No. 41,402; James Y. Go, Reg. No. 40,621; James A. Henry, Reg. No. 41,064; Willmore F. Holbrow III, Reg. No. P41,845; Sheryl Sue Holloway, Reg. No. 37,850; George W Hoover II, Reg. No. 32,992; Eric S. Hyman, Reg. No. 30,139; Dag H. Johansen, Reg. No. 36,172; William W. Kidd, Reg. No. 31,772; Erica W. Kuo, Reg. No. 42,775; Kurt P. Leyendecker, Reg. No. 42,799; Michael J. Mallie, Reg. No. 36,591; Andre L. Marais, under 37 C.F.R. § 10.9(b); Paul A. Mendonsa, Reg. No. 42,879; Darren J. Milliken, Reg. 42,004; Lisa A. Norris, Reg. No. P44,976; Chun M. Ng, Reg. No. 36,878; Thien T. Nguyen, Reg. No. 43,835; Thinh V. Nguyen, Reg. No. 42,034; Dennis A. Nicholls, Reg. No. 42,036; Daniel E. Ovanezian, Reg. No. 41,236; Babak Redjaian, Reg. No. 42,096; William F. Ryann, Reg. 44,313; James H. Salter, Reg. No. 35,668; William W. Schaal, Reg. No. 39,018; James C. Scheller, Reg. No. 31,195; Jeffrey Sam Smith, Reg. No. 39,377; Maria McCormack Sobrino, Reg. No. 31,639; Stanley W. Sokoloff, Reg. No. 25,128; Judith A. Szepesi, Reg. No. 39,393; Vincent P. Tassinari, Reg. No. 42,179; Edwin H. Taylor, Reg. No. 25,129; John F. Travis, Reg. No. 43,203; George G. C. Tseng, Reg. No. 41,355; Joseph A. Twarowski, Reg. No. 42,191; Lester J. Vincent, Reg. No. 31,460; Glenn E. Von Tersch, Reg. No. 41,364; John Patrick Ward, Reg. No. 40,216; Charles T. J. Weigell, Reg. No. 43,398; James M. Wu, Reg. No. P45,241; Steven D. Yates, Reg. No. 42,242; and Norman Zafman, Reg. No. 26,250; my patent attorneys, and Andrew C. Chen, Reg. No. 43,544; Justin M. Dillon, Reg. No. 42,486; Paramita Ghosh, Reg. No. 42,806; and Sang Hui Kim, Reg. No. 40,450; my patent agents, of BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP, with offices located at 12400 Wilshire Boulevard, 7th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90025, telephone (310) 207-3800, and James R. Thein, Reg. No. 31,710, my patent attorney.

I verily believe the original patent to be wholly or partially inoperative or invalid by reason that the patent claims less than I had a right to claim in the patent. The claim contains excess limitations not necessary for patentability. For example, the claim contains excess limitations not necessary for distinguishing over the prior art. Also, the claim fails to cover embodiments of the invention as claimed in the above-identified reissue application. The error arose during the drafting of the original application and during subsequent amendments in connection with the prosecution of the original application which resulted in the issuance of the patent. The attorney prosecuting the original application failed to appreciate the scope of the invention, and thus limited the claims as indicated above. All errors which are being corrected in the

present reissue application up to the time of filing of this declaration arose without any deceptive intention on my part. I further acknowledge my duty to disclose information which is material to the examination of the application under 37 CFR § 1.56.

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

Full Name of Sole/First Inventor Andrew J. Kuzma
Inventor's Signature Andrew J. Kuzma Date 31JAN00
Residence PORTLAND, OREGON Citizenship USA
(City, State) (Country)
Post Office Address 12558 NW WOODLAND CT
PORTLAND, OR 97229

**Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 1.56
Duty to Disclose Information Material to Patentability**

(a) A patent by its very nature is affected with a public interest. The public interest is best served, and the most effective patent examination occurs when, at the time an application is being examined, the Office is aware of and evaluates the teachings of all information material to patentability. Each individual associated with the filing and prosecution of a patent application has a duty of candor and good faith in dealing with the Office, which includes a duty to disclose to the Office all information known to that individual to be material to patentability as defined in this section. The duty to disclosure information exists with respect to each pending claim until the claim is cancelled or withdrawn from consideration, or the application becomes abandoned. Information material to the patentability of a claim that is cancelled or withdrawn from consideration need not be submitted if the information is not material to the patentability of any claim remaining under consideration in the application. There is no duty to submit information which is not material to the patentability of any existing claim. The duty to disclosure all information known to be material to patentability is deemed to be satisfied if all information known to be material to patentability of any claim issued in a patent was cited by the Office or submitted to the Office in the manner prescribed by §§1.97(b)-(d) and 1.98. However, no patent will be granted on an application in connection with which fraud on the Office was practiced or attempted or the duty of disclosure was violated through bad faith or intentional misconduct. The Office encourages applicants to carefully examine:

- (1) Prior art cited in search reports of a foreign patent office in a counterpart application, and
- (2) The closest information over which individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application believe any pending claim patentably defines, to make sure that any material information contained therein is disclosed to the Office.

(b) Under this section, information is material to patentability when it is not cumulative to information already of record or being made or record in the application, and

- (1) It establishes, by itself or in combination with other information, a prima facie case of unpatentability of a claim; or
- (2) It refutes, or is inconsistent with, a position the applicant takes in:
 - (i) Opposing an argument of unpatentability relied on by the Office, or
 - (ii) Asserting an argument of patentability.

A prima facie case of unpatentability is established when the information compels a conclusion that a claim is unpatentable under the preponderance of evidence, burden-of-proof standard, giving each term in the claim its broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification, and before any consideration is given to evidence which may be submitted in an attempt to establish a contrary conclusion of patentability.

(c) Individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application within the meaning of this section are:

- (1) Each inventor named in the application;
- (2) Each attorney or agent who prepares or prosecutes the application; and
- (3) Every other person who is substantively involved in the preparation or prosecution of the application and who is associated with the inventor, with the assignee or with anyone to whom there is an obligation to assign the application.

(d) Individuals other than the attorney, agent or inventor may comply with this section by disclosing information to the attorney, agent, or inventor.

O I P E JCG
FEB 11 2000

Approved for use through 09/30/2000, OMB 0651-0031
Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

STATEMENT UNDER 37 CFR 3.73(b)

Applicant/Patent Owner: Andrew J. Kuzma / Intel Corporation

Application No./Patent No.: 08/881,965 / 5,416,520 Filed/Issue Date: November 30, 1993/May 16, 1995

Entitled: Multiple Encoder Output Buffer Apparatus for Differential Coding of Video Information

Intel Corporation

(Name of Assignee)

, a

Corporation

(Type of Assignee, e.g., corporation, partnership, university, government agency, etc.)

states that it is:

- the assignee of the entire right, title, and interest; or
- an assignee of an undivided part interest

in the patent application/patent identified above by virtue of either:

RECEIVED

MAR 23 2000

Office of
DEPUTY A/C PATENTS

RECEIVED
FEB 16 2000
TECH CENTER 2700

A. [X] An assignment from the inventor(s) of the patent application/patent identified above. The assignment was recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office at Reel 8853, Frame 0472, or for which a copy thereof is attached.

OR

B. [] A chain of title from the inventor(s), of the patent application/patent identified above, to the current assignee as shown below:

1. From: _____ To: _____
The document was recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office at
Reel _____, Frame _____, or for which a copy thereof is attached.
2. From: _____ To: _____
The document was recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office at
Reel _____, Frame _____, or for which a copy thereof is attached.
3. From: _____ To: _____
The document was recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office at
Reel _____, Frame _____, or for which a copy thereof is attached.

[] Additional documents in the chain of title are listed on a supplemental sheet.

[] Copies of assignments or other documents in the chain of title are attached.

[NOTE] A separate copy (i.e., the original assignment document or a true copy of the original document) must be submitted to Assignment Division in accordance with 37 CFR Part 3, if the assignment is to be recorded in the records of the PTO. See MPEP 302-302.8]

The undersigned (whose title is supplied below) is empowered to sign this statement on behalf of the assignee.

Date



Signature

Carl L. Silverman

Typed or printed name

Director, Intellectual Property

Title

RECEIVED
APR 24 2000
TC 2700 MAIL ROOM